

1 things, that order imposes a moratorium on all oil and natural gas leasing activities on federal public
 2 lands and offshore waters. Louisiana, Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri,
 3 Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia have filed a complaint challenging
 4 Executive Order 14008 as unlawful under various provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

5 7. In December 2020, I produced a report under a consulting agreement with the
 6 Wyoming Energy Authority that examines fiscal and economic impacts of a moratorium or a ban on
 7 federal onshore oil and natural gas production. As relevant here, my report examined (1) the harm to
 8 State economies and jobs by a leasing and drilling ban, and (2) the reduction in oil production,
 9 economic activity, and state revenues due to foregone drilling under federal oil and gas leases. If it is
 10 not vacated, Executive Order 14008 threatens those very harms for Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado,
 11 Utah, North Dakota, Montana, and Alaska. The specifics of those harms are spelled out below.

12 HARM TO STATE ECONOMIES

13 8. Most oil and natural gas produced in the United States in the last decade has occurred
 14 using a production technology known as hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling. This technology
 15 has unlocked large deposits of oil and gas previously thought to be unrecoverable.

16 9. Oil and natural gas wells that use this technology produce at high rates just after initial
 17 production but face steep production declines thereafter. This steep production decline curve has
 18 raised the importance of drilling new wells to offset the production declines from previously completed
 19 wells. As a result, the ongoing process of drilling new wells results in significant investments into the
 20 economies of each of the States where these types of wells exist. But the leasing moratorium in
 21 Executive Order 14008 threatens to curtail this ongoing investment activity.

22 10. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of Wyoming would lose significant oil and gas
 23 investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Wyoming would suffer an average annual investment loss of
 24 \$2.3 billion; in 2025-30 an average annual investment loss of \$4.76 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual
 25 investment loss of \$6.9 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$8.77 billion.¹

26
 27 ¹ Dr. Timothy J. Considine, *The Fiscal and Economic Impacts of Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Lease Moratorium and Drilling Ban Policies*, Professor of Energy Economic with the School of Energy Resources at the University of Wyoming vi (Dec. 2020), available at <https://www.wyoenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Final-Report-Federal-Leasing-Drilling-Ban-Policies-121420.pdf>.
 28

11. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of New Mexico would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, New Mexico would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$2.6 billion; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$3.59 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$4.68 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$5.988 billion.²

12. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of Colorado would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Colorado would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$586 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$1.095 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$1.5 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$1.87 billion.³

13. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of Utah would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Utah would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$248 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$406 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$547 million; in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$698 million.⁴

14. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of North Dakota would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, North Dakota would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$279 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$358 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$467 million; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$601 million.⁵

15. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of Montana would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Montana would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$56 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$112 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$169 million; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$224 million.⁶

16. Under the leasing moratorium, the State of Alaska would lose significant oil and gas

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

1 investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Alaska would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$412
2 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$1.5 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual
3 investment loss of \$6.9 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$13.4 billion.⁷

4 17. Under a leasing moratorium, the States of Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah,
5 North Dakota, Montana, and Alaska would lose a combined average of 58,676 jobs annually for the
6 years 2021-25.⁸

7 18. Under a drilling ban, the State of Wyoming would lose significant oil and gas
8 investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Wyoming would suffer an average annual investment loss of
9 \$2.7 billion; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$4.9 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual
10 investment loss of \$7.07 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$8.95 billion.⁹

11 19. Under a drilling ban, the State of New Mexico would lose significant oil and gas
12 investments in its economy. In 2021-25, New Mexico would suffer an average annual investment loss
13 of \$3.1 billion; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$3.7 billion; in 2031-35, an average
14 annual investment loss of \$4.78 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$6.11
15 billion.¹⁰

16 20. Under a drilling ban, the State of Colorado would lose significant oil and gas
17 investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Colorado would suffer an average annual investment loss of
18 \$700 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$1.1 billion; in 2031-35, an average
19 annual investment loss of \$1.5 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$1.9
20 billion.¹¹

21 21. Under a drilling ban, the State of Utah would lose significant oil and gas investments
22 in its economy. In 2021-25, Utah would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$293 million; in
23 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$419 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment
24 loss of \$560 million; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$712 million.¹²

25
26 ⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at 44.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

22. Under a drilling ban, the State of North Dakota would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, North Dakota would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$336 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$370 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$477 million; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$613 million.¹³

23. Under a drilling ban, the State of Montana would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Montana would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$66 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$115 million; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$173 million; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$229 million.¹⁴

24. Under a drilling ban, the State of Alaska would lose significant oil and gas investments in its economy. In 2021-25, Alaska would suffer an average annual investment loss of \$456 million; in 2025-30, an average annual investment loss of \$1.57 billion; in 2031-35, an average annual investment loss of \$7.47 billion; and in 2036-40, an average annual investment loss of \$13.8 billion.¹⁵

25. Under a drilling ban, the States of Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, North Dakota, Montana, and Alaska would lose a combined average of 72,818 jobs annually for the years 2021-25.¹⁶

HARM TO STATE REVENUE

26. A leasing moratorium would significantly lower oil and gas production and thus significantly reduce the ad-valorem tax revenue, federal royalty payments, and lease-bonus payments the States receive from leasing on public lands.¹⁷

27. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of Wyoming would lose an average of \$304 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$722 million; in 2031-35, \$1.2 billion; and in 2036-40, \$1.77 billion.¹⁸

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.* at 44.

¹⁷ *Id.* at viii.

¹⁸ *Id.* at viii.

1 28. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of New Mexico would lose an
2 average of \$946 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$1.76 billion; in 2031-35, \$2.6 billion; and in
3 2036-40, \$3.6 billion.¹⁹

4 29. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of Colorado would lose an average
5 of \$59 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$126 million; in 2031-35, \$200 million; and in 2036-
6 40, \$279 million.²⁰

7 30. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of Utah would lose an average of
8 \$27 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$59 million; in 2031-35, \$92 million; and in 2036-40, \$132
9 million.²¹

10 31. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of North Dakota would lose an
11 average of \$136 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$249 million; in 2031-35, \$358 million; and
12 in 2036-40, \$489 million.²²

13 32. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of Montana would lose an average
14 of \$40 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$93 million; in 2031-35, \$ 146 million; and in 2036-40,
15 \$203 million.²³

16 33. Under the leasing moratorium, in 2021-25 the State of Alaska would lose an average of
17 \$100 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$454 million; in 2031-35, \$1.88 billion; and in 2036-40,
18 \$4.4 billion.²⁴

19 34. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of Wyoming would lose an average of \$345
20 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$746 million; in 2031-35, \$1.25 billion; and in 2036-40, \$1.8
21 billion.²⁵

22 35. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of New Mexico would lose an average of \$1.2
23 billion annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$1.87 billion; in 2031-35, \$2.7 billion; and in 2036-40, \$3.77
24

25 ¹⁹ *Id.* at viii.

26 ²⁰ *Id.* at viii.

27 ²¹ *Id.* at viii.

28 ²² *Id.* at viii.

29 ²³ *Id.* at viii.

30 ²⁴ *Id.* at viii.

31 ²⁵ *Id.* at viii.

1 billion.²⁶

2 36. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of Colorado would lose an average of \$73
3 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$132 million; in 2031-35, \$205 million; and in 2036-40, \$285
4 million.²⁷

5 37. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of Utah would lose an average of \$33 million
6 annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$62 million; in 2031-35, \$95 million; and in 2036-40, \$135 million.²⁸

7 38. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of North Dakota would lose an average of
8 \$175 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$264 million; in 2031-35, \$369 million; and in 2036-40,
9 \$499 million.²⁹

10 39. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of Montana would lose an average of \$42
11 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$94 million; in 2031-35, \$148 million; and in 2036-40, \$205
12 million.³⁰

13 40. Under a drilling ban, in 2021-25 the State of Alaska would lose an average of \$106
14 million annually in revenues; in 2025-30, \$465 million; in 2031-35, \$1.97 billion; and in 2036-40, \$4.5
15 billion.³¹

16 SPILLOVER HARMS

17 41. A moratorium on leasing, and a constructive ban or significant delay on drilling permits,
18 may also have significant spillover effects on State and private lands.³²

19 42. First, State and private lands will be affected by a moratorium or a ban because tracts
20 of federal, State, and Tribal lands are interspersed in a checkerboard pattern, meaning a moratorium or
21 a ban on federal lands will inevitably affect the value of adjoining lands.³³

22 43. Second, federal bans and moratoriums could apply to private and State lands subject to
23 a communitization requirement if it is determined to be in the public interest.³⁴

24 ²⁶ *Id.* at viii.

25 ²⁷ *Id.* at viii.

26 ²⁸ *Id.* at viii.

27 ²⁹ *Id.* at viii.

28 ³⁰ *Id.* at viii.

³¹ *Id.* at viii.

³² *Id.* at x.

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ *Id.*

1 44. If these spillover harms do emerge, the fiscal and economic losses stemming from a
2 drilling ban and leasing moratorium would rise linearly with the shares of private and State lands tied
3 to economic regulation. In other words, a 10 percent spillover effect would increase fiscal and
4 economic losses by 10 percent.³⁵

5 I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED
6 STATES OF AMERICA AND THE STATE OF LOUISIANA THAT THE FOREGOING IS
7 TRUE AND CORRECT.

8
9 Executed in Laramie, Wyoming this 30th day of March, 2021.

10
11 _____

12 TIMOTHY J. CONSIDINE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 _____
³⁵ *Id.*